

Message Text

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 01 GENEVA 00732 061658Z

62

ACTION EUR-25

INFO OCT-01 IO-14 ISO-00 CIAE-00 DODE-00 PM-07 H-03 INR-10

L-03 NSAE-00 NSC-10 PA-04 RSC-01 PRS-01 SPC-03 SS-20

USIA-15 SAM-01 ACDA-19 CU-04 NEA-11 TRSE-00 SAJ-01

AEC-11 OMB-01 OIC-04 DRC-01 /170 W

----- 080901

R 061605Z FEB 74

FM USMISSION GENEVA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC 3817

INF ALL CSCE CAPITALS 88

USNMR SHAPE

USLOSACLANT

USDOCOSOUTH

USCINCEUR

C O N F I D E N T I A L GENEVA 0732

VIENNA ALSO FOR US DEL MBFR

E. O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: PFOR

SUBJECT: CSCE: SUB-COMMITTEE ON MILITARY SECURITY (CBM'S);

TABLING OF UK DRAFT RESOLUTION

REFERENCE: GENEVA 634

1. SUMMARY. TABLING OF UK DRAFT RESOLUTION ON CBM'S
DREW PRAISE FROM NUMBER OF ALLIED DELEGATIONS THOUGH NORWEGIAN
EXPRESSED DIFFERING VIEWS ON SOME OF ITS ELEMENTS. SEVERAL
NEUTRAL DELS ALSO COMMENTED FAVORABLY WHILE AT SAME TIME EXPRESSING
RESERVATIONS ARISING FROM DRAFT'S FAILURE TO DEAL ADEQUATELY WITH
THEIR OWN PROPOSALS AND PREOCCUPATIONS. MOST WIDESPREAD CRITICISM
WAS ABOUT LACK OF PROVISION IN DRAFT FOR NOTIFICATION OF SEPARATE AIR
AND NAVAL MANEUVERS/MOVEMENTS. SOVIET AMB MENDELEVICH DISAPPROVINGLY
CITED UK DRAFT AS FURTHER EVIDENCE OF PROFOUND DIFFERENCES OF OPINION
PREVAILING WITHIN SUB-COMMITTEE AND HE URGED THAT DRAFTING STATE BE
CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 GENEVA 00732 061658Z

DEFERRED TO ALLOW FURTHER TIME FOR DISCUSSION. HE PRIVATELY EX-

PLAINED TO UK REP THAT SOVIET DEL NEEDED MORE TIME TO GET NEW INSTRUC-

TIONS FROM MOSCOW WHICH WOULD HOPEFULLY AFFORD THEM MORE FLEXIBILITY. SUB-COMMITTEE REACHED COMPROMISE ON ITS WORK PROGRAM IN TERMS OF "GENTLEMEN'S AGREEMENT" TO HAVE TWO MORE WEEKS OF DISCUSSION AND THEN BEGIN DRAFTING STATE. END SUMMARY.

2. UK DRAFT RESOLUTION ON CBM'S WAS TABLED AT FEB. 5 MEETING OF SUB-COMMITTEE ON MILITARY SECURITY. DRAFT (POUCHED) IS IDENTICAL WITH TEXT TRANSMITTED REFTEL EXCEPT FOR VERY MINOR EDITORIAL CHANGES. UK REP TOLD SUB-COMMITTEE THAT DRAFT PRIMARILY COVERS PARA 23 OF HELSINKI RECOMMENDATIONS AND WILL NEED TO BE AMPLIFIED. TAKING INTO ACCOUNT PARAS 22 AND 24 ALSO. HE POINTED OUT THAT MOVEMENTS ARE TREATED IN SAME MANNER AS MANEUVERS IN DRAFT AND SAID THIS REFLECTS STRONG DESIRES OF SEVERAL DELS. HE NOTED, HOWEVER, THAT CERTAIN OTHERS HAD VOICED RESERVATIONS CONCERNING INCLUSION OF MOVEMENTS.

AS FOR THE DRAFT'S FORMULATION OF THE NATURE OF THE OBLIGATION, UK REP EXPLAINED THAT WORDS HAD BEEN CHOSEN ("HAVE DECIDED THAT THEY WILL") WHICH IN ENGLISH IMPLY A STRONG POLITICAL COMMITMENT BUT NOT A LEGAL ONE.

3. ALLIED REACTIONS. DRAFT RESOLUTION DREW PRAISE FROM FRG, FRENCH, CANADIAN, BELGIAN, AND NORWEGIAN REPS. US AND OTHER ALLIED REPS DID NOT OFFER COMMENTS. FRENCH AND CANADIANS SPECIFICALLY ENDORSED USE OF WORD "WILL" IN EXPRESSING NATURE OF OBLIGATION AND CANADIAN OBSERVED THAT SUB-COMMITTEE'S STUDY OF MOVEMENTS HAD NOT YET BEEN COMPLETED. NORWEGIAN REP SAID HIS GOVT WOULD LIKE CLEARER, MORE COMPREHENSIVE LANGUAGE IN OPERATIVE PARAGRAPH I-C SO AS TO INCLUDE ALL CATEGORIES OF FORCES; E.G., LAND, AIR, NAVAL, AMPHIBIOUS AND AIRBORNE. NORWAY ALSO FAVORED PROVISION FOR POSSIBLE NOTIFICATION BELOW LEVEL OF ONE DIVISION IN CERTAIN AREAS. NORWEGIAN REP ADDED THAT PREAMBLE MIGHT BE DEVELOPED TO INCLUDE REFERENCE TO POSSIBLE FUTURE MEASURES, ALONG LINES OF YUGOSLAV PROPOSALS, AND THAT PART III COULD BE EXPANDED AS REGARDS THE SWEDISH PROPOSAL ON MILITARY BUDGETS. GENERALLY, ALLIED COMMENTS INDICATED SUB-COMMITTEE SHOULD USE THE UK PROPOSAL AS THE FRAMEWORK FOR ITS DRAFTING EFFORTS.

4. NEUTRAL REACTIONS. SPANISH REP COMMENTED THAT TOTAL PARALLELISM IN DRAFT'S HANDLING OF MOVEMENTS AND MANEUVERS MIGHT CAUSE HIS DEL
CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 GENEVA 00732 061658Z

SOME DIFFICULTY. HE THOUGHT OPERATIVE PARAGRAPH I-C SHOULD BE EXPANDED TO COVER SEPARATE NAVAL AND AMPHIBIOUS ACTIVITIES AND INDICATED

DESIRE TO EXPAND COVERAGE OF SPANISH PROPOSALS IN PART III OF DRAFT. CYPRIOT REP REMINDED SUB-COMMITTEE OF HIS GOVT'S VIEWS IN FAVOR OF NOTIFICATION PROVISIONS COVERING SEPARATE AIR, NAVAL AND SPECIAL FORCES PLUS COVERAGE OF MEDITERRANEAN. HE ALSO OBSERVED THAT DRAFT LACKED PROVISION AGAINST SHOWS OF FORCE AND FAILED CALL FOR REDUCTION

OF MANEUVERS AND MOVEMENTS IN TIMES OF CRISIS. MALTESE AND SWEDISH REPS ENDORSED DRAFT'S MATCHING COVERAGE OF MOVEMENTS AND MANEUVERS BUT SUPPORTED IDEA OF INCLUDING NOTIFICATION OF SEPARATE NAVAL, AIR AND AMPHIBIOUS FORCES PLUS LOWERING THRESHOLD FOR NOTIFICATION BELOW LEVEL OF ONE DIVISION IN SOME CASES. SWEDISH REP SAID AREA OF APPLICATION SHOULD EXPLICITLY INCLUDE INTERNATIONAL WATERS AND AIR SPACE WITHIN AND ADJACENT TO EUROPEAN LAND MASS. HE ALSO SAID "SWEDISH DEL INTENDED TO TABLE FORMULATIONS EXPANDING COVERAGE OF THEIR PROPOSAL ON BUDGETS IN PART III. SWISS REP CALLED FOR NOTIFICATION OF SEPARATE AIRBORNE MANEUVERS/MOVEMENTS AND, LIKE SWEDISH REP.

THOUGHT BASIC OBLIGATION SHOULD BE FORMULATED IN BINDING TERMS THROUGH USE OF WORD "SHALL" INSTEAD OF "WILL."

5. SOVIET STATEMENT. WARSAW PACT REPS DID NOT COMMENT SPECIFICALLY ON UK DRAFT RESOLUTION; HOWEVER, DURING SUBSEQUENT DISCUSSION OF SUB-COMMITTEE'S WORK PROGRAM SOVIET AMBASSADOR MENDELEVICH CITED IT DISAPPROVINGLY WHEN ARGUING THAT IT WAS PREMATURE TO BEGIN DRAFTING PHASE. HE NOTED THAT SOME DELEGATIONS WOULD STILL HAVE COMMENTS TO MAKE ON UK DRAFT, THAT SUB-COMMITTEE HAD NOT COMPLETED ITS STUDY OF MOVEMENTS, AND THAT DIFFERENCES OVER CRITERIA FOR NOTIFYING MANEUVERS WERE STILL TOO PROFOUND TO PERMIT DRAFTING TO BEGIN. HE ACKNOWLEDGED THAT BEFORE HOLIDAY RECESS SOVIETS HAD FAVORED COMMENCEMENT OF DRAFTING, AS THEY NOW DID IN OTHER SUB-COMMITTEES, BUT THAT SUBSEQUENT ADVERSE TRENDS, EVIDENT IN FRG WORKI
E E E E E E E

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 01 JAN 1994
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: SECURITY, COMBINED MILITARY EXERCISES, AGREEMENT DRAFT, MILITARY PLANS
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 06 FEB 1974
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: golinofr
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1974GENEVA00732
Document Source: CORE
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: GS
Errors: N/A
Film Number: n/a
From: GENEVA
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1974/newtext/t19740253/aaaabxez.tel
Line Count: 135
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE
Office: ACTION EUR
Original Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 3
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: GENEVA 634
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: golinofr
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags: ANOMALY
Review Date: 19 MAR 2002
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <19 MAR 2002 by garlanwa>; APPROVED <30 APR 2002 by golinofr>
Review Markings:

Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
30 JUN 2005

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: CSCE: SUB-COMMITTEE ON MILITARY SECURITY (CBM'S); TABLING OF UK DRAFT RESOLUTION
TAGS: PFOR, CSCE
To: STATE
Type: TE
Markings: Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005